



IFW

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Shougo SATO

Group Art Unit: 2852

Application No.: 10/772,404

Examiner: Q. Grainger

Filed: February 6, 2004

Docket No.: 118571

For: IMAGE FORMATION APPARATUS AND PROCESS CARTRIDGE

APPLICANT'S SEPARATE RECORD OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Grainger in the December 7, 2005 telephone interview. The following is Applicant's personal record of the interview.

During the interview, the Applicant's representative presented arguments that the Amendment filed on November 23, 2005 distinguishes over the applied references for the reasons presented therein. In particular, Sato et al., JP62-145258A (Sato) fails to disclose that the image forming apparatus has a guide portion as defined in claims 14 and 25. Further, Nishikawa, JP60-140264A fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sato as applied to claim 14. Applicant's representative directed the Examiner's attention to the Abstract and Figs. 1-8 of Sato, where "the projection pieces 16 moves onto a pressure projection 10 during the movement to rotate and raise a rotary lever 12, and a lever 14" (Abstract). "The lever 14 is drawn to put a developing device 17 close to the photosensitive body 3 in the process unit 2" (Abstract). Applicant's representative also directed the Examiner's attention to Figs. 2 and 8, which clearly

show that the frame body 7 is removed from the main device body 1 and is separated, and as such is separated from the developing device 8. Accordingly, the developing device 8 of Sato is fixed in the main device body 1 and does not change relative positions with respect to the photosensitive body when the process unit 2 is loaded in and unloaded from the main device body 1. Thus, Sato does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 14.

Although the Examiner alleged during the interview that Sato's rotating body 9, pressure projection 10 and projection piece 16 of rotating lever 12 are allegedly guide portions as defined in claims 14 and 25, it is clear from the language of claims 14 and 25 that the alleged guide portions of Sato do not correspond to the guide portions recited in Applicant's claims 14 and 25.

Further, as discussed at the interview, nowhere does Sato disclose or suggest that the main frame has a guide portion, as recited in claim 25 or that the guide portion guides one of the photosensitive body and the processing device to shift a position of the one of the photosensitive body and the processing device relative to the process cartridge when the process cartridge is loaded in and unloaded from the main body, as recited in claim 25.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kurt P. Goudy
Registration No. 52,954

JAO:KPG/tea

Date: December 9, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--